

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-3, 7-25 and 42-50 are pending in the present application with Claim 50 having been amended by the present amendment.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claim 50 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph and under 35 U.S.C. § 101; Claims 1-3, 7-11, 13, 42, 43, 45 and 50 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Numata; and Claims 12, 14-25, 40 and 46-49 were allowed.

Applicants thank the Examiner for the indication of allowable subject matter.

Regarding the rejection of Claim 50 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph and under 35 U.S.C. § 101, Claim 50 has been amended in light of the comments noted in the outstanding Office Action. In particular, Claim 50 has been amended to recite that the document classification system is for classifying a document based on contents of the documents of which contents contains a plurality of items which do not relate to chapters, clauses, sentences and paragraphs of the document. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested these rejections be withdrawn.

Claims 1-3, 7-11, 13, 42, 43, 45 and 50 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (e) as anticipated by Numata. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent Claim 1 recites that the designating means designates at least one of the items displayed in the displaying means. Independent Claims 7 and 50 include similar features but independent Claim 7 is a processor readable medium storage program code and independent Claim 50 includes the same features recited in Claim 1 and further recites that the items do not relate to chapters, clauses, sentences and paragraphs of the document.

A description will now be given of an example of the document data and the converted-data obtained from the document data (see page 29, line 16 to page 31, line 20). FIG. 5 is an illustration for explaining an example of the document data 501 and the converted data 502 obtained from the document data 501.

The example of the document data 501 is a patent publication data retrieved from a patent database. The document data 501 contains information regarding items contained in the patent publication such as "Patent Application Number", "Filing Date", "Name of the Inventor(s)", "Title of the Invention", "Object", "Constitution", "Claim 1", "Prior Art", "Means for Solving the Problem", "Action", "Embodiment" and "Effect of the Invention".

In the conventional document classification system, each document data is handled as a single set of data. Accordingly, document data containing a plurality of items is also handled as a single set of data, and contents of all of the items in the document data are subjected to the classification process. Thus, there may be included an item unnecessary for a view desired by an operator or an item which provides undesired influence to a result of classification.

However, in the claimed invention, the operator can designate at least one item which is considered to be necessary for the classification. For example, when patent publications are subjected to a classification process and when the operator desires to perform classification with respect to an object of invention, items such as "Object", "Means for Solving the Problem", "Action" and "Effect of the Invention" can be designated. On the other hand, when the operator desires to perform classification with respect to means for solving, the items "Means for Solving the Problem" and "Embodiment" can be designated. When the items to be subjected to classification are designated, the converted data is produced from the document data.

The example of FIG. 5 is a case in which the operator designates the items “Object”, “Means for Solving the Problem”, “Action” and “Effect of the Invention” from among the items contained in the document data 501, and the converted data 502 is produced based on the designated items of the document data 501.

As shown in FIG. 5, the converted data 502 is produced by extracting and combining sentences corresponding to the items “Object” (An object of the present invention is to ... store corresponding screen information with history information.), “Means for Solving the Problem” (In order to achieve the above-mentioned objects, ... which is displayed on a multi-window.), “Action” (According to the above-mentioned structure, ... operates to display the screen information.) and “Effect of the Invention” (According to the present invention, ... effectively reproduced.).

The outstanding Office Action indicates Numata discloses a designating means and cites the classification unit designating section 2 which designates specific sections of a document. However, Applicants note that the above-noted independent claims include a feature in which one of the items displayed in the display means is designated by the designating means. On the contrary, Numata discloses a display unit, but there is no description in Numata that one of the items in the document can be designated using the display unit. Thus, the advantages of the present invention cannot be achieved with Numata.

Further, independent Claim 10 was amended in the previous response to include the feature “with a dimensional number different from a dimensional number of the document feature vector.” Independent Claim 42 includes similar features. In this respect, the outstanding Office Action refers to equation 18 of Numata, and states that the equation 18 produces a dimensional number (T) that is different from the dimensional numbers (F, G, and H) that represent vectors input into the equation.

However, the equation 18 of Numata is an addition of matrices G, H, and J. In Numata, the dimensional number of each of the matrices T, G, H and J is fixed to t which is a total number of keywords. Thus, the equation 18 of Numata does not produce a dimensional number of T that is different from the dimensional number of F, G, and J.

On the other hand, in the present invention, as indicated in the equation (1),  $W=M^T C X^+$ , described at page 46, the input matrix X is a t-dimensional matrix, but the dimension k of the matrix M can be of any number which satisfies the relationship  $1 \leq k \leq \min(t, d)$ . Accordingly, the dimension of the matrix W can also be any number which satisfies the relationship  $1 \leq k \leq \min(t, d)$ .

Thus, in light of the above discussion, it is respectfully submitted independent Claims 1, 7, 10, 42 and 50 and each of the claims depending therefrom are also allowable.

Figures 5 and 6 have also been amended to include the reference numeral 501 discussed in the specification. Enclosed are replacement drawings.

Consequently, in light of the above discussion and in view of the present amendment, the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance and an early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



\_\_\_\_\_  
Gregory J. Maier  
Attorney of Record  
Registration No. 25,599  
David A. Bilodeau  
Registration No. 42,325

Customer Number  
**22850**

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413 -2220  
(OSMMN 08/03)  
GJM:DAB/bu

I:\ATTY\DAB\0557-4645-AM.DOC